



King's Research Portal

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Harris, A. (Accepted/In press). A Fresh Stripping of the Altars? Liturgical Language and the Legacy of the Reformation in England, 1964–1984. In K. Cummings, R. Orsi, & T. Matovina (Eds.), *A Lived History of the Second Vatican Council* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

A Fresh Stripping of the Altars? Liturgical Language and the Legacy of the Reformation in England, 1964–1984

Alana Harris

In an intensely personal and highly emotive letter written in 1967 to his bishop, layman Peter Hutton reluctantly confessed that:

I am no longer able to recognise the Church of today as being the same as that to which I pledged my loyalty [37] years ago . . . [and] developments have now reached a point where it is no longer possible for me any longer to silence the criticisms of my conscience, my reason and my judgment.¹

This founder-member of the London-based Latin Mass Society (LMS) was writing to express, in terms that ironically foregrounded conciliar precepts such as the *sensus fidelium* and the “primacy of conscience,” his objections to the changes in Roman Catholicism inaugurated following the promulgation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, on December 4, 1963.² In evaluating these transformations in the Roman Rite, including the substitution of English for Latin as the language of the Mass, Hutton concluded:

It is further all too evident that the Reformers in their iconoclastic enthusiasm would gladly actually physically destroy the glorious monuments of the Catholic tradition and past . . . In exchange they would like to substitute erections in the debased modern idiom representative of their new religion.³

Such strongly expressed sentiments self-consciously evoked historical precedent and the specter of the English Protestant Reformation, analogously linking the present transformations in rite and rote to the upheavals experienced by the sixteenth-century English Catholic community and remembered as a “stripping of the altars.”⁴

In analyzing the frequently heated and often acrimonious debates over the language of the liturgy occasioned in the wake of the Second Vatican Council, this essay foregrounds the particularity of the English Catholic context (centered around the Diocese of Westminster) in its reception of these changes.⁵ This lived religious

history identifies the centrality of a latent but potent narrative of English history, which foregrounded the Council of Trent and a history of penal persecution. English Catholics across the ecclesiological and political spectrum were engaged in a reflexive recollection of the Reformation and a politicized and presentist invocation of the legacy of the recusant martyrs as contemporaneous resources to integrate or interrogate “the vernacular.” In this employment of freighted constructions of their history and collective memory, English Catholics struggled with concepts of tradition and development – a process also polemically encapsulated in the present-day debates surrounding Vatican II and a so-called “hermeneutic of continuity”⁶ – to find mechanisms to cope with these profound shifts in religious practice and the reformulation of a “modern” English Catholic identity. As the Council Fathers, drawing upon the legacy of the liturgical movement, mobilized concepts of *ressourcement and rapprochement* in drafting the “Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy,”⁷ so too did English Catholics – those supportive or equally those despairing of the changes. They thereby utilized understandings of “history”⁸ and “ecumenical receptivity” in reaching their own conclusions about the “doings in Rome.”

Utilizing a rich seam of correspondence to the archbishop of Westminster, the archival records of the London-based Latin Mass Society and the Jesuit archives in Farm Street (West London), as well as the editorials and letters that dominated diverse strands of the English Catholic press until the 1980s, this essay explores the ways in which England’s largest religious minority employed a “rhetoric of the Reformation” and differing configurations of “historical continuity” not only to deal with the implementation of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, but also the decree on ecumenism, *Unitatis Redintegratio* (1964). It argues that the debates of English Catholics about their history, religious memories and ultimately their Catholic identity

as a minority in “Protestant Britain”⁹ – a religious landscape that was simultaneously shifting through decolonization and increasing (non-Christian) immigration – properly centered on the changes to the liturgy, given the pivotal significance of the Mass as a reenactment/recreation of the historical events at the heart of Christianity. Intrinsic to Christ’s command to “do this in remembrance of me” is the recognition of the power of the past, interpreted and adapted to the needs of the present. A close examination of the vocabularies and tropes of ordinary English Catholics when discussing the movement to the vernacular not only exhibits the range of positions adopted on linguistic, liturgical, and ultimately ecclesiological questions in the years following the council, but also illuminates the broader perspectives of English Catholics on class identity and social mobility, integration into British society and their relationships with their non-Catholic (and particularly Church of England) compatriots. At the heart of these debates, which pivoted around the altar and the liturgy, are fundamental issues about the spirituality and social identity of English Catholics negotiating a period in Britain, as elsewhere in the Western European world, of widespread change and transition.¹⁰

Liturgical Change

The “Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy,” known by its opening words, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, was the first of the council’s documents and was endorsed by an overwhelming majority of bishops but not, tellingly, by the then archbishop of Westminster, Cardinal William Godfrey.¹¹ While stressing that “the use of the Latin language is to be maintained in the Latin rites,”¹² the constitution also expressed its strong desire for “all believers to be led to take a full, conscious and active part in liturgical celebration.”¹³ To this end:

In the mass, the administration of the sacraments, and in other parts of the liturgy, there cannot at all infrequently exist a practice of using the local language, a practice which is really helpful among the people.¹⁴

The constitution advocated that “it should therefore become possible for more scope to be given for such practices,”¹⁵ and provided general guidance as to the parts of the Mass and other sacraments in which the local language could be incorporated.¹⁶ It also recommended a “revision of the way the mass is structured . . . so that it becomes easier for the people to take a proper and active part.”¹⁷ Implementation of these principles commenced with the motu proprio *Sacram Liturgiam*, issued by Pope Paul VI on January 25, 1964, which provided guidance “for the preservation, the improvement and – where needed – the reform of the liturgy.”¹⁸ A spate of further instructions followed throughout the decade, extending the role of the vernacular and introducing other changes to the liturgical setting and devotional practices. These developments culminated in the much-debated apostolic constitution *Missale Romanum* on April 3, 1969, which ushered in a new order of Mass replacing the Tridentine Rite promulgated by Pope Pius V in 1570 (and refined in subsequent years) in response to many of the challenges of the Protestant Reformation.¹⁹ In issuing his subsequent *General Instruction* on the adapted Roman Missal, Pope Paul described it as continuous with the tradition of Trent, through the preservation of “the deposit of faith handed down to us through the more recent Councils . . . [but nevertheless constituting] a very important step forward in the liturgical tradition.”²⁰ Reflecting on the changes from a distance of four decades, the English priest and well-respected church historian Adrian Hastings acutely observed that:

When one considered that the Latin mass had remained almost unchanged for more than five hundred years, that its revision constituted one of the most burning issues of the Reformation and one which Rome had been adamant in refusing, then the speed and decisiveness of liturgical reform in the 1960s becomes really amazing.²¹

Described by Reformation historian (and Catholic commentator) Eamon Duffy as the “unfreezing of a liturgical tradition, which had seemed to many as sacrosanct and immemorial, beyond question or change,”²² the changes in the Mass were met with particular consternation by many English Catholics. The English Church, with the notable exception of liturgists such as Clifford Howell, SJ, and those promoting dialogue masses within the Young Christian Workers’ movement,²³ was theologically unprepared for the developments foreshadowed decades before by the Continental liturgical movement.²⁴ The English Church had based much of her self-understanding and public identity around a distinctiveness vested in Romanism, ultramontane practices, Latin, and (in the 1960s, rapidly disappearing) endogamy.²⁵ As the English Catholic hierarchy acknowledged in 1964, the implementation of the liturgical decree:

Had launched a movement which will uproot all kinds of age-old habits, cut psychological and emotional ties [and] shake to the foundation the ways of thought of three to four million Catholics.²⁶

The Diocese of Westminster was at the epicenter of these debates, not only because of its size and profile – encompassing “swinging Sixties” central London²⁷ and the See of the Primate of England and Wales – but also because it was at the heart of debates about Vatican II. Much of the conciliar dynamism (and dissension), epitomized within the diocese by entities such as the ill-fated Corpus Christi theological college (the English Lumen Vitae)²⁸ and the Latin Mass Society headquarters, played out through the increasingly well-educated, metropolitan and ethnically diverse parishes north of the Thames, including Middlesex and the suburban, middle-class commuter zones of Hertfordshire. With a population of nearly half a million Catholics in 1960,²⁹ which made it slightly smaller but nevertheless institutionally more powerful than the still very Irish diocese of Liverpool in the north of England,³⁰ the Diocese of Westminster was recognized as the flagship of English Catholicism. Moreover its archbishop

functioned as the primary point of contact, as leader of the English hierarchy, for those disillusioned, despairing, or disgruntled about the course of liturgical change throughout the country.

Setting the Scene

In his opinion piece on the reception of the Liturgical Constitution within the Manchester-based *Universe and Catholic Times* – the largest selling religious weekly in the world with a circulation in the 1960s that remained near 200,000 copies³¹ – the Benedictine monk Benet Innes wryly observed that:

“How are you getting along with the new liturgy?” is as common an opening for a conversation among Catholics nowadays as a remark about the weather. The liturgical changes must have struck deep to have rivalled the weather as a topic for conversation!³²

The first Sunday of Advent in 1964 marked the introduction of some vernacular into limited parts of the liturgy within England and Wales and was dubbed “E-day” by one columnist.³³ These reforms were soon surpassed by further changes in early 1965 which resulted in English being used for most of the Mass except for the Canon and some specific, well-known prayers.³⁴ While there were other changes occasioned by these liturgical reforms, it was this wholesale movement from Latin to English that excited the most controversy in England and that forms the focus of this study.³⁵

Resistance to liturgical change began with small, personal advertisements in mainstream British press, with readers of *The Times* and *The Guardian* newspapers asked: “Will anyone wishing to preserve the ancient Latin liturgy in England and who wishes to join me in an appeal please write to . . . ”³⁶ Lay Catholics Cathleen Hindmarsh from Manchester³⁷ and Geoffrey Houghton-Brown in London, initiated these advertisements. Houghton-Brown (who was to serve as chairman between 1969–70 and London diocesan representative from 1965–1972), in his rich, unpublished history of the LMS, recounted that the idea for *The Times* “appeal” came to him on

the feast day of St. Edward the Confessor in 1964, while praying at his tomb in Westminster Abbey.³⁸ Other rallying calls followed, from Gillian Edwards and Ruth McQuillan of Cambridge³⁹ and Mary Teresa Parnell of Sussex, who used the correspondence columns in papers like the *Daily Telegraph* as a spokesperson for:

[The] many Roman Catholics who do not express their views outwardly, [but] who are filled with sorrow at the passing of the Latin in the liturgy and look forward to the coming changes with real dismay.⁴⁰

This lay-led agitation led to the formation of the Latin Mass Society in January 1965, under the impetus of Hugh Byrne,⁴¹ as “an association of Catholic Faithful dedicated to the preservation of the traditional Latin Mass as one of the legitimate forms of the Church’s liturgy.”⁴² In 1969 the society boasted 2,417 members,⁴³ rising to around 5,000 in 1971⁴⁴ – with a preponderance of women taking active organizational roles⁴⁵ and financial support for office premises, secretarial support, and publications funded by Lady Claude Kinnoull.⁴⁶ The LMS became the focal point for such traditionalist dissent, presenting arguments for the retention of the Latin Mass in each diocese and the minimization of liturgical change to the English bishops, particularly Cardinal Heenan, who was personally sympathetic to their arguments and ecclesiastically cautious, if slightly more media savvy than his predecessor.⁴⁷ The promulgation of the revised order of the Mass in 1969, the so-called *Novus Ordo*, caused considerable internal dissension within the LMS, centered around differing interpretations of the association’s relationship to the Pope and understandings of “orthodoxy,” which were interrogated through the membership’s commitment to Latin as a liturgical language as opposed to the old Latin rite itself. The result was a split in the membership and the formation by Dr. R. Richens of an alternative, smaller, Association for Latin Liturgy (1969), which advocated the use of Latin within the New Rite.⁴⁸

Following this schism, the LMS unequivocally refocused its attention on the restoration of the Tridentine Mass (1570) and the promotion of this cause through a variety of innovative mechanisms. In 1971 with much publicity, it coordinated a petition to the pope signed by many distinguished scholars, writers, historians, and musicians who “call[ed] to the attention of the Holy See the appalling responsibility it would incur in the history of the human spirit were it to refuse to allow the traditional Mass to survive”⁴⁹ The impact of this so-called “Agatha Christie indult,” to which the famous crime writer was a signatory, added weight to the formal request of Cardinal Heenan to Rome for a dispensation for English Catholics to use the Tridentine Mass “on special occasions.”⁵⁰ This dispensation, which was exceptional in the context of international Catholicism (excepting Poland),⁵¹ was granted on November 5, 1971. As such, this compromise “helped to contain what could have developed into a nasty and difficult case of open defiance,”⁵² and illustrates the passion and concerted opposition to these changes within a section of the English Catholic community (and beyond),⁵³ in contrast to their mostly favorable reception in Scotland and Ireland,⁵⁴ and other parts of the English-speaking world, including Britain’s former colonies.⁵⁵ Consternation and controversy continued throughout the 1970s, and was a feature of the wider discussions surrounding the National Pastoral Congress in Liverpool in 1980 – an unprecedented (and unrepeated) gathering of over 2,000 clerical and lay representatives who assembled in a synod-like forum to evaluate the state of the contemporary church. The dispensation granted to English Catholics to use the Tridentine Mass “on special occasions” was interpreted relatively liberally – though not uniformly – in English dioceses throughout the 1970s,⁵⁶ and this policy was given further centralized Roman endorsement in 1984, when Pope

John Paul II granted a universal dispensation and then emphatically commended the Latin liturgical tradition in his *motu proprio Ecclesia Dei*, in 1988.⁵⁷

Remembrance of Times Past

In the introduction to his 1969 study of the modern Mass, dedicated to LMS members whom he called “defenders of the Faith,” the Reformation historian Hugh Ross Williamson acknowledged that:

An English historian is apt, by the nature of things to be suspicious of liturgical change. He knows that in his country it has happened before and that the consequences of it have moulded his religious background.⁵⁸

This inherent tendency to resist present liturgical innovation through reference to the Reformation was also noted by advocates of reform like Michael Richards, who emphasized in 1966 that:

The memory of penal times is still an active influence in the approach of the English Catholic to the style of his public worship . . . It has been given a particular form by our life as a small minority . . . conscious of being authentic representatives of a past whose achievements others have inherited and now transformed.⁵⁹

This constant invocation of the legacy of the Reformation was not confined to academic critiques of the liturgical changes, but attained a currency within more popular commentaries, voluminous correspondence within the Catholic press, and agonized letters from the laity to the archbishop of Westminster. Such tendencies were initially manifest in the frequent denunciations of liturgical progressives as “reformers,” perhaps most caustically expressed in the 1965 *The Tablet* correspondence columns by Evelyn Waugh, who bewailed the loss of the Latin Mass and decried the vernacularists as “cranks” pursuing a schismatic, modern-day Reformation.⁶⁰ The iconic convert novelist called upon historical memories of Reformation devastation when speaking for “suffering Catholics who have for many years now seen their public devotions stripped of more and more which they valued.”⁶¹ His extended commentary blazed combatively:

To history let us turn. You will find that there have been a few inspired geniuses who have revived the Church and, in doing so, changed it. For every one of these there have been hundreds of presumptuous and misguided men . . . All the tongues of Babel are to be employed save only Latin, the language of the Church since the mission of St Augustine. That is forbidden to us.⁶²

Early English missionary and Reformation history, the antiquity of the Latin Mass and the authority of the Old Testament were employed to give legitimacy to his obduracy. Seeking relative anonymity rather than public notoriety, a self-styled “Very Ordinary Catholic” wrote in a similar vein a year earlier to the archbishop of Westminster. Communicating his distress as a “convert of 33 years” about the “liturgical shambles” and the distracting “proceedings in the Sanctuary” within his London-based parish, this layman fumed that “‘mystery’ has become a dirty word among the reformers, they want to strip it out of our Churches [and] are in fact following the steps of the Protestant reformers so long ago.”⁶³

The potent trope of the English Catholic penal past was frequently employed by public polemicists and correspondents resistant both to liturgical change and, what was seen as its corollary, ecumenical rapprochement. In yet another critique of “the invalidity of the New Mass,” provocatively entitled *The Great Betrayal* (1970), Hugh Ross Williamson drew upon the hagiography of the scholar, cardinal, and martyr St. John Fisher, canonized in 1935 alongside Thomas More, to chastise the current English hierarchy for its complicity and capitulation in the replacement of the 1570 Mass.⁶⁴ A few years earlier in 1967, the bishop of Clifton was rebuked in congruent terms by Peter Hutton, who contested:

The Church down the ages has scorned to make an “aggiornamento” with the world; the Cross, the Colosseum and Tyburn are witness of it.⁶⁵

In Hutton’s historical analogy, the trials for traditional Catholics presented by the council mirrored the tribulations of the martyrs of the past, and their sufferings even resembled those of the rejected Messiah. The explicit recollection of the Elizabethan

martyr-priests at Tyburn (the historic site of the penal executions by hanging, near Mable Arch in London) was also mobilized by Ella Collier, writing to Cardinal Heenan in 1964, to remind him that:

It was the Protestant ministers who shrieked at Blessed Robert Johnson “Pray in English!” . . . It was the Latin which the Reformers hated, because it bound the Church in England to Rome and that Pope . . . This polyglot Mass will have exactly the reverse effect.⁶⁶

The precedent of martyrdoms past offered a potent and emotive metaphor and was often redeployed, as reflected in the correspondence of Rev. H. E. G. Rope in *The Universe* in 1964:

Some of us owe our conversion, under God, to the splendid army of martyrs who are, if she only knew it, the true glory of our country. To Erasmus and his like we owe nothing whatever . . . “So the Faith was planted. So it must be restored.”⁶⁷

For Father Rope, as Tertullian, “the blood of the martyrs is seed,” and this co-mingling of the patristic and penal was also adopted by *The Tablet* contributor Rosalind Scott:

Our progressives presumably dismiss the very unaccommodating English martyrs as products of the later Middle Ages or of the Council of Trent – yet they are fond of extolling the early Church, many of whose members chose the arena, or other forms of torture, rather than take a broadminded view of the Roman gods.⁶⁸

Through such appeals to tradition, resistance to social accommodation and recollection of the sacrifices of the sixteenth century, those opposed to the post-conciliar reforms employed a “Reformation rhetoric” to convince their co-religionists of the dangers of this present-day re-stripping of the altars. Their aim was to rally English Catholics to resistance, drawing upon historically acknowledged constructions of denominational differentiation and Catholic isolation from wider English society.

As the traditionalist opposition to the translation of the Mass was formulated in historical terms, it is not surprising that some arguments in favor of the changes, voiced by Catholics from across the social spectrum writing to *The Tablet* and *The*

Universe as well as their pastors, were similarly premised on various constructions of English Catholic history. These approaches sometimes took the form of rejection of the need for continuity altogether, but more often appealed to the priority of the early church or sought to reconcile Reformation references with contemporary ecumenical concerns. The more radical stance of acknowledging innovation and disparaging conservation was generally adopted by those enthusiastically embracing the vernacular, such as the radically progressive (but marginal) pro-Marxist *Slant* group centered in Cambridge⁶⁹ or the noted English liturgist J. D. Crichton, who frankly surmised that “we are starting out on a venture similar to that of the reformers of the sixteenth century.”⁷⁰ A Yorkshire laywoman, Joyce Carey, was also playfully dismissive of conservative appeals to history in opposition to the vernacular, ironically parodying those who say:

What was good enough for our fathers (chained in prison dark, etc.) should be good for us . . . We might equally argue that it is quite wicked to install central heating and electric lights in church, since these too were unknown to our forefathers.⁷¹

In a more scholarly vein, a group of mostly clerical and academic commentators writing in 1964 directly contested the use of Reformation history and the insistence on the Latin Mass, rhetorically asking:

Is England’s history all that unique? It is those very countries which shared the Reformation with her that have pioneered the liturgical movement and inspired the Council’s Constitution.⁷²

In the assessment of these correspondents, English Catholics had “long resisted worship in our mother tongue, simply *because* it was promoted by the Protestants.”⁷³

Another tactic for defusing such criticisms was to link the vernacular to a common English nationalism, evidenced in *The Tablet*’s contemporaneous advocacy of a historically minded translation modeled on “the vernacular liturgy of the English peoples which has stood the test of four centuries [and] earned the soubriquet ‘incomparable.’”⁷⁴ Similarly, C. R. A. Cunliffe, the president of the Vernacular

Society of Great Britain, noted the aptness of the change to the vernacular with the “quartercentenary of the birth of Shakespeare” and the legacy of English as “a *lingua franca* for the modern world as ever Latin was for Christendom.”⁷⁵ In place of recollecting the anniversary of Trent, recourse was made to the common, cross-denominational history of the English tongue. The debates in modern scholarship about the supposed recusant Catholic background of this quintessentially “English” poet perhaps also recommended Shakespeare’s invocation to illustrate the compatibility of English nationalism with Catholicism and the Mass rendered in (poetic) English.

It was to avoid such charges of the “Protestantization” of the liturgy, and undue Anglican accommodation, that commentators and correspondents also drew upon an alternative patristic history highlighted by the liturgical movement itself,⁷⁶ to stress the continuity of the English language with the earliest Christian traditions. Conservative MP, Catholic convert, and prolific author Christopher Hollis⁷⁷ typified such tactics:

I was very interested the other day to discover from some tolerably well, if not excessively well instructed Catholics, how many of them believed that the use of Latin in the Mass dated back to the first origins of the Church.⁷⁸

This former Notre Dame visiting professor invited his current readership of ordinary, mostly Northern Catholics to “stop and think” whether “Our Lord had instituted the Sacrament in Latin words,”⁷⁹ whereas layman Randle Lunt bluntly challenged his audience of converts and literati: “did Jesus Christ at the Last Supper say ‘*hoc est enim Corpus meum*?’”⁸⁰ Following the introduction of the New Rite in 1970, Dr. Anthony Roberts wrote to Cardinal Heenan to assert his preference for the new liturgy (despite his own fluency in Latin) and to air his frustrations with “many ignorant criticisms,” such as:

The wording of the Our Father is “Protestant.” So what? It is quite orthodox. I gently point out that this ending is in the third century liturgy of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil also.⁸¹

Most correspondents, however, urged a “return to the sources” in ways that strategically muted the congruity between this enterprise and any Protestant resonances, best evidenced in a letter from seven ordinary (though well-informed) laymen to *The Tablet* in 1964 tackling the “traditionalism” of the Latin Mass Society directly:

As for its being “traditional” there are traditions and traditions, some good, some bad, and by no means all belonging to the tradition of the Church. As a matter of historical fact the Latin low Mass is an impoverished and truncated version of an ancient corporate celebration of the Eucharist . . . ultimately in contradiction with the central teaching of the Gospel.⁸²

In these references to ancient practices and the Gospel, these Catholics were stressing a common Christian foundation, but one that effectively circumvented charges of denominational compromise or capitulation. However, such arguments, and those advocating a dispensation altogether from historical continuity, failed to persuade people like J. A. Green, writing to *The Universe* in 1965 to articulate his puzzlement at those “very keen to return to some primitive rite and thereby completely ignore 2000 years of Catholic development and ‘growing up in Christ.’”⁸³ Predictably, Evelyn Waugh, anticipating just such rhetorical tactics in 1962 when writing in *The Spectator* (a conservative weekly of longstanding influence), remained unconvinced by:

The strange alliance between archaeologists absorbed in their speculations on the rites of the second century, and modernists who wish to give the Church the character of our own deplorable epoch. In combination they call themselves “liturgists.”⁸⁴

For Waugh and Green, laymen from different quite backgrounds, yet exhibiting similar ecclesiological temperaments, these developments were denounced as diminishing Catholics’ liturgical inheritance and disregarding the history of that church in England.

History and Priorities of the Present

Between the above-canvassed perspectives of the “traditionalists” and the “liturgists,” the correspondence of many Catholic laity and clergy within the press and to their bishops revealed an attempt to reconcile the sustaining historical narratives of the past with the social priorities of the present – chiefly articulated as English Catholics’ increasing educational and socio-economic mobility, integration in British society (through “mixed marriages”) and a greater ecumenical orientation in the post-war period.⁸⁵ As *The Tablet* editor Douglas Woodruff recognized, writing sympathetically of the apprehensions of cradle Catholics and the fears of converts:

The Latin Mass has been in some sense a symbol of our faith. It will take time for us to adapt ourselves to these distinctions between doctrine and discipline which are much more clearly evident to other people.⁸⁶

This negotiation of doctrine and discipline, and implicitly the distinctiveness of the English Catholic community deprived of such symbols – part of a raft of disappearing semiotics such as bells and smells and fish on Fridays that now rendered Catholics “just like other people,” to paraphrase English Catholic anthropologist Mary Douglas⁸⁷ – took the form of a reconsideration of Catholic history and identity, rather than the heated (and more explicitly) theological debates on the continent. Symptomatic of these troubled re-conceptualizations of Catholicity is a report in *The Universe* on a conference in early 1964 at Campion Hall, the Jesuit residence in Oxford, which sought to “discuss the ecumenical movement as it affects the man on the street.”⁸⁸ The staff reporter for the newspaper continued:

One after another a don’s wife, a psychologist, a medical student and a young convert voiced their fears. Conversions would drop. The faith would be “watered down.” We would “betray” the English Martyrs if we “gave way” now.⁸⁹

The conference spokesmen, LMS pamphleteer (and later chairman) and administrator at Oxford’s Radcliffe Infirmary Jerome Burroughs, concluded that a lack of self-confidence and ignorance of the facts were the source of most difficulties. In reality,

the problems for ordinary Catholics lay in reconciling the often-contradictory conclusions to be drawn from these “facts” within the context of post-conciliar Catholicism and a rapidly transforming British society.

A prominent example of this complex re-conceptualization of English Catholic history is evident in the troubled correspondence within the press, to the archbishop of Westminster, and indeed in the archives of and public communications to the Office of Vice Postulation (OVP) (coordinated out of the Jesuit headquarters at Farm Street, London) to canonize the Forty Martyrs of England and Wales. This clerically coordinated cause for Vatican recognition of those men and women executed during the years of the Henrician and Elizabethan Reformations, commenced unproblematically in 1960 but became intensely contested in the years surrounding the council until what came to be called the Cause’s successful conclusion with their canonization in 1970.⁹⁰ As well as providing scope for popular devotions (and countless “favors”), particularly in the recusant heartland of the north of England,⁹¹ the Cause appealed to an indigenous recusant tradition stressing “ties of blood, environment and nationality.”⁹² Such sentiments were encapsulated in a 1963 commission from the OVP to Daphne Pollen to paint a collective illustration of the Forty Martyrs, with the Tower of London, gallows of Tyburn, and a makeshift altar center stage (Figure 1). Within this historically inflected re-visioning of a group of highly diverse saints, virtue is presented in romanticized and typologized terms – demure Margaret Clitherow in the foreground, aristocratic Philip Howard painted with his hound, and surrounding ranks of male sanctity spanning the priesthood, scholarship (with Jesuit Edward Campion clasping a manuscript) and the virile martyrdom of teacher Richard Gwyn, with hat and quill.

The remembrance of penal persecution and continuing Catholic dissension began to be acknowledged as potentially incompatible with the new emphasis on ecumenism following *Unitatis Redintegratio* (1964), reinforced by the historic meeting in Rome in 1966 of Pope Paul VI and Archbishop of Canterbury Michael Ramsey – thereby initiating an unprecedented series of bilateral ecumenical conversations. The fear of “betraying” the faith for which the martyrs died, through the countenance of ecumenical conversation, collaboration (or emulation), played through many articles and letters, and was the subject of an extended, emotive discussion in *The Tablet* in 1965 about whether the martyrs “died for ecumenism.”

Joan Eland opened the debate when she reflected:

All of this is old history, and no-one wants to drag up old bitterness, but it does seem to me ridiculous to say that the martyrs died for anything but that one true faith, as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be. Amen.⁹³

A laywoman working on the canonization campaign, Margaret FitzHerbert, agreed with Eland’s purported near-credal statement, herself affirming that “anyone who has read the lives and utterances of the martyrs knows that, rightly or wrongly, they regarded Protestantism as the enemy and themselves as soldiers in the fight against it.”⁹⁴ Father Rope also weighed into this forum, facetiously observing that the martyrs “were not forerunners of the Abbé Portal or Fr Kung” (evoking Catholic theologians spanning a century of ecumenical conversations from Malines to the pages of *Concilium*), but “they were reactionary enough to die for that denomination against which the gates of hell have not prevailed, either before or after 1962.”⁹⁵ He concluded that the “only ecumenism” those executed knew was the “*unconditional* submission to the *one unchanging uncompromising Church*” (original emphasis).⁹⁶ Numerous correspondents to Cardinal Heenan from 1964 onwards agreed,⁹⁷ and representative of such correspondence (especially in the wake of the New Rite) was

an irate letter penned by Roger de Wever (from Outer Broad, Suffolk) denouncing as “hippies” those who appealed to “relevance” with a preference for “an instant Mass . . . in the language of the supermarket.”⁹⁸ Rebuking the archbishop for indifference, he claimed to cleave for intercessory intervention to:

Our Blessed Lady, St Pius V, St Thomas More, St John Fisher and the Blessed English martyrs who generously gave their lives rather than forgo the very Mass which has now been thrown into the ecumenical hotpot.⁹⁹

As Jerome Burrough wrote in a letter to *The Tablet* in 1971, “I accept the validity of the New Rite, as indeed I must, but what are my grandchildren going to believe that Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley did not believe?”¹⁰⁰

Promoters of the Cause also recognized these difficulties, and in a devastating report in 1966 to the hierarchy reflecting on his first year as sole vice-postulator of the Cause, James Walsh, SJ, was disarmingly direct. He wrote in unequivocal terms of the “unpalatable truth of dwindling devotion” and the attitudes of the Catholic laity “ranging from minority support to majority indifference.”¹⁰¹ In his opening gambit, he charted the difficulties he confronted in fulfilling his brief, as:

In many quarters, it has become the fashion to see devotion to the saints as *démodé*; the cult of the Martyrs as a sign of the state of siege, and the Cause as inopportune to the ecumenical movement.¹⁰²

Despite some genuine strains of popular devotion,¹⁰³ invocation of the Forty Martyrs (and appeal to the tactics of recusancy) did seem to recommend itself chiefly to those concertedly opposed both to the vernacular and the new missal. Traditionalist campaigner (and frequent correspondent within the pro-reform pages of the *Catholic Herald*) D. G. Galvin wrote to his cardinal in 1970 to share his conviction that “the historic Latin Mass was all things to all men” and that the emerging trend for the celebration of the Tridentine Rite in some London churches (and indeed Catholic houses) had “shades of the old Catholic recusants!”¹⁰⁴ Indeed an illicit parish was set up in south London, with funding from many members of the LMS, for the regular

provision of the Tridentine right by a Lefebvrist priest.¹⁰⁵ St. John's Wood correspondent Barbara Mitchell Cots directly invoked this legacy when writing to her bishop, claiming her lineage as "a member of a Catholic family (Throckmorton) who have never lost their faith" and asked his eminence plaintively if he could "hold out a crumb of hope that the Mass we know and love will not be suppressed."¹⁰⁶

Yet while such accounts strategically evoked an English Catholic aristocratic past, LMS advocates – in the vein of other conservative moral campaigners like Mary Whitehouse, who utilized 1960s counterculture ideals (and methods) for traditionalist ends¹⁰⁷ – also presented their campaign as "democratic" and a cross-class, broad-based protest movement. President Sir Arnold Lunn was at pains to point out that "it is untrue to suggest that the [Latin] Mass only appeals to a particular class."¹⁰⁸ In a letter to Cardinal Heenan in late 1965 written in his capacity as LMS chairman, Peter Kenworthy-Browne assured his archbishop that the "large number[s] . . . suffering greatly . . . are by no means confined to the well-educated" and, drawing upon conciliar notions of "active participation," these principled rebels find within the Latin Mass "a source of spiritual strength, refreshment and repose [that] promotes for them the true participation in the Holy Sacrifice."¹⁰⁹ Echoing remarkably similar debates within the Church of England with its near contemporaneous reform of the Book of Common Prayer through the 1960s, appeals to liturgical "authenticity," the "numinous" and true engagement in the Mass were mobilized by liturgical conservationists and innovators alike.¹¹⁰ Yet within the archbishop's correspondence and letter columns in the Catholic press, there are some traces of working class, grass-roots discontent with the abandonment of Latin, ranging from recounted bus-stop conversations between a grandee and an immigrant "domestic servant, no clever degrees for her!"¹¹¹ and the correspondence of Mrs. F. Coupe from Lancashire, who

wrote to *The Tablet* on behalf of “busy mothers” who missed the opportunity to stop and “lapse into quiet acquiescence, into the sublime peace of the Mass.”¹¹² Father Anthony Hayes of Silvertown (in East London’s Docklands) spoke of the devotion of his working-class parish to the Latin Mass and their appreciation of “a little ‘elegance’ and ‘refinement’ whenever possible – something ‘special’ on Sundays.”¹¹³ Perhaps the most arresting plea to Cardinal Heenan was a heart-rending appeal from an Irish Catholic woman on behalf of her twenty-four-year-old motor mechanic son who “would be most upset if he know I had written to you.”¹¹⁴ Chronicling the devastating impact of these “liturgical infidelities” and the contesting the justification of this “suffering [as] going to benefit future generations,” Mrs. Pegge closed by reflecting:

He values Latin intensely as being so ancient, so loved and suffered for in the past, and so apart from the coarse everyday English that surrounds him at work. Also he values silence.¹¹⁵

Explicitly re-working (and democratizing) notions of a recusant past through implicit evocation of conciliar concepts of *aggiornamento* and the evolution of radical base communities, LMS member Mary Prendergast wrote in justificatory terms about a Tridentine Mass held after the promulgation of the New Missal at the Carmelite Church in Kensington:

This was not an end, a nostalgic “harking back,” but a beginning, a real “renewal.” There are thousands of loyal Catholics only waiting and praying for the restoration of the true and only acceptable, because unambiguous, form of Mass. . . . [Please support us] so that we are not driven to the makeshift of house-Masses.¹¹⁶

Cardinal Heenan’s response to much of this correspondence was an ambivalent mixture of support and perplexity, torn by his contrasting constructions of what ultramontane Catholic loyalty (then and now) required, and the curious mixture of appeals to conscience and renewal by traditionalists that, for him, sometimes echoed the excesses of progressives.¹¹⁷ His exasperation was articulated in

correspondence to Dr. J. B. Robinson (from Hartlepool, County Durham), who wrote in 1970 to vent about the Lutheran concepts of the Eucharist¹¹⁸ seemingly embodied in the various words of consecration and announcing his intention to leave the church as a “form of protest . . . in clear conscience.”¹¹⁹ Heenan’s revealing reply retorted:

I sympathise with you but I cannot agree with you. To cut ourselves off from the sacraments because we do not agree with the teaching of the Pope is a very Protestant thing to do. Some have left the Church because of the Pope’s teaching on contraception and now priests are leaving because of his teaching on the vow of chastity.¹²⁰

In the context of large-scale revolt amongst English Catholics over issues of contraception and celibacy – which itself still awaits a thorough historical examination¹²¹ – and the inauguration of formal ecumenical activities between the Church of England and the Church of Rome (with the establishment of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission [ARCIC] in 1969), the archbishop of Westminster sought a mechanism to calm this vocal, vociferous, and intractable minority. In a telling piece of internal correspondence in February 1970 between Cardinal Heenan and the episcopal chairman of the National Liturgical Commission for England and Wales, the archbishop acknowledged the impact of these “fresh shocks to the poor old faithful” and asked “can nothing be done for the Tridentine Mass non-cranks who would like a little peaceful co-existence for the old Mass?”¹²² The solution this reluctant innovator adopted was to write to Pope Paul VI on October 30, 1971, to seek permission for “certain groups of the faithful . . . on special occasions . . . to participate in the Mass celebrated according to the Rites and texts of the former Roman Missal.”¹²³ Yet even this was not enough for some, as the so-called “Heenan Indult” granted on November 5, 1971, added a caveat that “at all regular parish and other community Masses, the Order of the Mass in the new Roman Missal should be used” lest more regular practice “become a sign or cause of disunity in the Catholic community.”¹²⁴ Alongside regular celebrations of the Tridentine Rite at the

Brompton Oratory (Kensington),¹²⁵ Notre Dame de France (off Leicester Square), Our Lady and St. Simon (Carmelite church, Kensington) and indeed Westminster Cathedral (where four of the eight representatives elected to the parish council, and staff such as Fr. Ware and organist Colin Mawby, were LMS members),¹²⁶ a small village church in Norfolk became the scene of national attention. This followed an article in the *Sunday Observer* newspaper in 1975 reporting the decision of the bishop of East Anglia (and Roman Catholic co-chair of ARCIC), to close Downham Market parish and therefore remove its incumbent, Father Oswald Baker (1915–2004) – a figurehead for traditionalists in his intransigent refusal to offer the *Novus Ordo* in this rural area. Denounced even within the then mostly progressive pages of *The Tablet* as an “unnecessary confrontation,”¹²⁷ the incident was gently parodied by John Ryan (1921–2009), creator of the well-loved English children’s cartoon character Captain Pugwash and *Catholic Herald* chronicler of the post-Vatican II church (Figure 2). Above the caption “*You can come out, Father . . . His Lordship’s gone,*” Ryan sketched a wry, sympathetic picture of an altar *ad orientem*, a packed congregation of mostly older people (including women wearing mantillas) which spilled outside the church, and the vested deacon communicating his message of reassurance through a trapdoor, reminiscent of the priest-holes of penal times.

Yet the majority of items within Cardinal Heenan’s mailbag, and indeed the majority of articles within the Catholic press, eschewed the resurrection of an English Catholic past modeled on *Brideshead Revisited*, penal defiance, and the persecution of the ghetto. Not all agreed with the assessment of Fr. Bryan Houghton – a parish priest from Bury St. Edmunds in Suffolk who retired on the introduction of the New Order – who in his witty novel *Mitre and Crook* (1979) charted the (re)conversion of the fictional Bishop Forester with the reintroduction of the Old Mass and recognition of

his (and other bishops') arrogant disregard of their flock.¹²⁸ Indeed as the pages of David Lodge's novel illustrated, published for a British audience under the title *How Far Can You Go?* (1980) and set in London from the 1950–70s, it is traditionalist Miles who is out of step with his friends Michael and Miriam, who are at the forefront of the *agape* house-masses presided over by Fr. Austin Brierley.¹²⁹ In the archbishop of Westminster's reply to a complaint in 1964 about the lack of lay consultation surrounding the liturgical changes, Cardinal Heenan referred to the "hundreds of letters . . . awaiting my return [from Rome] . . . deal[ing] with the vernacular," and that "almost all of those from the less well educated are expressions of thanks."¹³⁰ As Hennen's private secretary Monsignor F. A. Miles also acknowledged in a letter five years later to Mrs. Olive Scott (and clearly contrary to his own sympathies), the results of a diocesan questionnaire distributed to churches across London seemed to indicate that "it was undeniable that the great majority in these parishes welcomed what has been done."¹³¹ This assessment was confirmed in an oral history interview with Monsignor Canon Tom Egan (b. 1942, County Mayo), who was a newly ordained parish priest from 1967–1972 in a Hiberno-English, upper working-class parish in Hanwell (north London). The parish of Our Lady and St. Joseph also hosted a growing community of post-war Asian migrants and, as the space provided by the Victorian Pugin church was outgrown, in 1967 a new concrete modernist building was erected.¹³² Speaking about the liturgical changes during these years, Fr. Egan stressed that the majority of his congregation were unfazed by the liturgical changes, accustomed as they were to clerical deference and passive acceptance of episcopal direction.¹³³ Self-confessedly "typical" (but vociferous) Liverpudlian Catholic Bernard Jubb agreed, denouncing the LMS as out of touch with working-class parishes to assert:

I find the current liturgy quite as dignified as the Latin . . . Catholicism is not a game for the elite, it must include everybody, and you aren't going to get in the harlots by telling them to educate themselves first. I think everybody must be sorry to lose Latin . . . but it is ridiculous to act as if the Pope and the Council were turning us over to the Bishop of Woolwich or worse.¹³⁴

In his reference to the notorious Anglican bishop of dockland South London, John A. T. Robinson, who had appeared as an expert defense witness in the *Lady Chatterley's Lover* obscenity trial and established his reputation as a “radical” theologian through his 1963 internationally best-selling book *Honest to God* which synthesized the work of Paul Tillich, Dietrich Bonhoeffer and Rudolf Bultmann,¹³⁵ Jubb dismissed as paranoia the fears of those who asserted English Catholicism's capitulation to modernism or Protestantism. For one youthful correspondent to Cardinal Heenan in 1969, sixteen-year-old David Power, the liturgical changes had increased both his personalized and corporate involvement, as:

I can truly say that I have never experienced such a great sense of communion and participation as with the Normative Mass . . . [and] the greater emphasis on being Christian than Catholic, all enhance the meaning of Mass . . . I really get quite a “kick” out of . . . [the] experience [of] this calming and relaxing union with the ground of our being.¹³⁶

Scarcely making allowances for youthful fervor, Cardinal Heenan expressed some pleasure that his youthful charge from Hertfordshire found the changes “attractive,” but sternly chastised him for using “agnostic” expressions such as “ground of our being”¹³⁷ made popular through the pages of *Honest to God*.

By the 1970s – following the semi-regular provision of the Tridentine Mass under the terms of the Indult and the implosion of the LMS over critiques of the “validity” of the New Rite (and support of Archbishop Lefebvre)¹³⁸ – the furore over liturgical form and language had dissipated as an issue within mainstream parishes. Most Catholics, such as Mrs. Pantcheff from Watford writing to the *Catholic Herald* in 1974, dismissed as eccentrics those who “think [Catholicism] was invented in

1570.”¹³⁹ As the editor of *The Universe* reported in a special “ballot of issues” ahead of the National Pastoral Congress in 1980, to which 3,500 readers replied:

The revised liturgy is very much on the readers’ minds. The heaviest correspondence I have ever had came on the question of the translation of the New Rite of Mass. Most of the readers who wrote [in 1969] said they would prefer a better translation, but most of those who voted in the ballot [now] say the present translation is a good one.¹⁴⁰

This level of equanimity among a sample the editor described as “Mass-going Catholics whose commitment to the Church and the Faith is strong enough to lead them . . . to buy a Catholic paper [and] post their ballot forms” should be contextualized against their balloted strong opposition to birth control, against married or female priests, and overwhelmingly against “recognition of the validity of Anglican Orders.”¹⁴¹ Against these markers of moral and ecclesiological conservatism, the fact that there was general satisfaction with the New Rite (and only 50 percent support for allowance of the Tridentine Mass occasionally),¹⁴² and that the New Missal did not excite any great controversy among the National Pastoral Congress delegates generally,¹⁴³ illustrates an accepting consensus by 1980. Two decades after the council most English Catholics, across a generational and theological spectrum, no longer interpreted the post-conciliar liturgical reforms within a historical continuum characterized by Catholic dissent and Reformation iconoclasm. It was the issue of contraception, and the representations of Cardinal Basil Hume and Archbishop Derek Worlock of Liverpool in favor of a reexamination of *Humanae Vitae* at the 1980 Synod of Bishops on the Family in Rome, which now represented the site of longstanding mainstream English Catholic “recusancy.”¹⁴⁴

Conclusion

Writing in 1965 as the chairman of the Liturgical Commission for England and Wales, and drawing upon his pastoral experience as bishop of Leeds (and then Birmingham), Archbishop George Dwyer rightly acknowledged:

The Mass is the most intimate and personal act of our religion [and] associations of a lifetime have gathered around it.¹⁴⁵

The ambivalence implicit within this statement, from the prelate responsible for the implementation of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* and the liturgical instructions that followed, epitomized the stance of his fellow bishops – and indeed many of the laity – who were mostly unprepared for the conciliar liturgical developments but passively dutiful in their adherence to Vatican directives.¹⁴⁶ While there were some Westminster parishes renowned for their liturgical experimentation and an enthusiastic embrace of reform (such as St. John the Evangelist in Islington under Fr. Vincent Rochford), and certain religious orders (such as the Olivetan Benedictines under Dom Edmund Jones at Christ the King, Cockfosters,¹⁴⁷ and the Dominican Priory in North London),¹⁴⁸ the vast majority introduced the post-conciliar changes to rite, rote, architectural setting, and devotional practice gradually and cautiously. Paradoxically, something of the conciliar dynamism in seeking to encourage active participation and the “priesthood of the laity,” a recognition of the “primacy of conscience” and greater engagement with and reflexive understanding of the Mass was instead exhibited in the articulate protests (in the secular press) and the proactive pressure group maneuvers of Catholic traditionalists and the Latin Mass Society. In the debates around the appropriate liturgical language for English Catholics, and the implications of the reforms to the Mass chiefly interrogated in terms of “orthodoxy” and denominational distinctiveness, there was clearly a “rhetoric of the Reformation” operational and differing configurations of “historical continuity” mobilized by both advocates and critics alike. Nevertheless as this essay has also shown, profoundly “modern” conciliar considerations and the preoccupations of British society negotiating the post-war period were also at play. In these differing interpretations of loyalty and lay autonomy, the devotional needs of the contemporary church, and the

status and standing of English Catholics especially in relationship to the established Church of England there was, indeed, a reorientation (if not quite a reformation) underway.

¹ Letter from Peter Hutton to Bishop Joseph E. Rudderham, bishop of Clifton, December 15, 1967, pp. 1–2, London Mass Society (LMS), miscellaneous correspondence file.

² For an in-depth theological consideration of the constitution and its legacy, see Massimo Faggioli, *True Reform: Liturgy and Ecclesiology in Sacrosanctum Concilium* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012).

³ Letter from Peter Hutton to Bishop Joseph E. Rudderham, December 15, 1967, p. 4, LMS, miscellaneous correspondence file.

⁴ Cambridge historian Eamon Duffy popularized the phrase “the stripping of the altars” as a description of the English Reformation in his highly controversial but influential study *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England c.1400–c.1580*, 2nd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005). Duffy is an outspoken critic of the liturgical reforms following the Second Vatican Council. See Eamon Duffy, “The stripping of the liturgy,” *The Tablet*, July 6, 1996, p. 882 and *Faith of Fathers: Reflections on Catholic Tradition* (London: Continuum, 2004).

⁵ As Auberon Waugh reflected in his article “Martyrs in Vain,” *The Times*, May 2, 1970, p. 9, the “peculiar spirit of English Catholicism” in its attachment to the Tridentine Mass meant that the liturgical changes were felt “more acutely among England’s five million Catholic than among the 545 million Catholics who live elsewhere.” There was some agitation within wider Europe also – the European Centre of Traditionalist Catholics collected 100,000 signatures in 1971 to protest the disappearance of the Tridentine Rite – see Geoffrey Houghton-Brown, *Notes on the Struggle to Retain the Roman Liturgy 1964–1972*, unpublished manuscript, 1975, p. 6, LMS, miscellaneous correspondence file. Contrast “Behind the Scenes: English Liturgy in Australia,” *Search*, May 1964, 19–22.

⁶ Pope Benedict XVI’s Christmas Address to the Roman Curia, December 22, 2005, www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2005/december/documents/hf_ben_xvi_spe_20051222_roman-curia_en.html, accessed June 30, 2012, and N. Ormerod, “Vatican II – Continuity or Discontinuity? Towards an Ontology of Meaning,” *Theological Studies* 71, no. 3, 2010, 609–36.

⁷ Faggioli, *True Reform*, cf. Aidan Nichols, *Looking at the Liturgy: A Critical View of its Contemporary Form* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1996); Alcuin Reid, *The Organic Development of the Liturgy: The Principles of Liturgical Reform and their Relation to the Twentieth Century Liturgical Movement Prior to the Second Vatican Council* (Farnborough: St Michael’s Abbey Press, 2004).

⁸ See John W. O’Malley, *Tradition and Transition: Historical Perspectives on Vatican II* (Wilmington Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1989), p. 174; J. Komonchak, J. O’Malley, Neil J. Ormerod, Steven Schloesser, *Vatican II: Did Anything Happen?* (London: Continuum, 2008).

⁹ See Simon Green, *The Passing of Protestant Britain: Secularisation and Social Change c. 1920–1960* (Cambridge University Press, 2011) and Matthew Grimley, “The Church of England, Race and Multiculturalism, 1962–2012” in Jane Garnett and

Alana Harris (eds.), *Re-scripting Religion in the City: Migration and Religious Identity in the Modern Metropolis* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), pp. 207–21.

¹⁰ See Hugh McLeod, *The Religious Crisis of the 1960s* (Oxford University Press, 2007); Callum Brown, *The Death of Christian Britain: Understanding Secularisation 1800–2000* (2nd ed., London: Routledge, 2009) and *Religion and the Demographic Revolution: Women and Secularisation in Canada, Ireland, UK and USA since the 1960s* (London: Boydell and Brewer, 2012).

¹¹ Giuseppe Alberigo and Joseph A. Komonchak (eds.), *History of Vatican II*, vol. I, *Announcing and Preparing Vatican Council II: Toward a new era in Catholicism* (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 1995), pp. 117, 214 and 259.

¹² Norman P. Tanner (ed.), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils: Volume Two, Trent to Vatican II* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1990), SC36.1, p. 828.

¹³ *Ibid.*, SC14, p. 824. For more about “active participation,” see also the noted English liturgist J. B. O’Connell, *Active Sharing in Public Worship: A Commentary on the Chief Purposes of the Second Vatican Council’s Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* (London: Burns and Oates, 1964).

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, SC36.2, p. 828.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ *Ibid.* See SC54 (readings and common prayer), 63 (sacraments and sacramental) and 101 (Divine Office).

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, SC50, pp. 830–1.

¹⁸ Austin Flannery (ed.), *Vatican Council II: Volume I. The Conciliar and Postconciliar Documents* (New York: Costello Publications, 1996), p. 41.

¹⁹ Joseph Cardinal Cordiero, “The Liturgy Constitution: *Sacrosanctum Concilium*” in Alberic Stacpole (ed.), *Vatican II by Those Who Were There* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1986), p. 187.

²⁰ Flannery (ed.), *Vatican Council II*, p. 158.

²¹ Adrian Hastings, *A History of English Christianity 1920–2000* (London: SCM Press, 2001), p. 526 and Keith Robbins, *England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales: The Christian Church 1900–2000* (Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 350–5.

²² Eamon Duffy “Rewriting the Liturgy: The Theological Implications of Translation” in Stratford Caldecott (ed.), *Beyond the Prosaic: Renewing the Liturgical Movement* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), p. 97.

²³ See Clifford Howell, *The Work of Our Redemption* (Oxford: Catholic Social Guild, 1955) and Charles Walker, *Worker Apostles: the YCW Movement in Britain* (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1994).

²⁴ E.g. “We have been made to feel a dull, unimaginative lot, content with old routine, while others adventurously cast off the stranglehold of rubrics in search of new, more meaningful modes of expression,” in Michael Richards, *The Liturgy in England* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1966), p. 3. See also the admission of Cardinal Heenan, *A Crown of Thorns: An Autobiography 1951–1963* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1974), p. 339.

²⁵ See Michael P. Hornsby-Smith, *Roman Catholics in England: Studies in Social Structure since the Second World War* (Cambridge University Press, 1987); *The Changing Parish: A Study of Parishes, Priests and Parishioners after Vatican II* (London: Routledge, 1989); *Roman Catholic Beliefs in England: Customary Catholicism and Transformations of Religious Authority* (Cambridge University Press, 1991).

²⁶ Statement of Bishop Dwyer of Leeds, British Representative on the Liturgical Commission, reported in “The English Bishops on Scheme 13,” *The Tablet*, October 31, 1964, pp. 1244–5.

²⁷ On London in the 1960s, see Jerry White, *London in the Twentieth Century: A City and Its People* (London: Viking, 2001) and Mark Donnelly, *Sixties Britain: Culture, Society and Politics* (Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2005).

²⁸ V. A. McClelland, “John Carmel Heenan, The Second Vatican Council and the Rise and Fall of an English *Lumen Vitae*” in A. Seery (ed.), *Essays in Tribute to J. Valentine Rice, 1935–2006* (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 2010), pp. 69–97.

²⁹ The Diocese of Westminster reported a Catholic population of 470,000 (compared with 497,000 in Liverpool) – see *The Catholic Directory, 1960* (London: Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1960), p. 723.

³⁰ For details on Liverpool, see Frank Boyce, “Catholicism in Liverpool’s Docklands: 1950s–1990s” in M. P. Hornsby-Smith (ed.), *Catholics in England 1950–2000: Historical and Sociological Perspectives* (London: Continuum 1999), pp. 46–66; and Peter Doyle, *Mitres and Missions in Lancashire: the Roman Catholic Diocese of Liverpool, 1850–2000* (Liverpool: Blue Coat Press, 2005).

³¹ George Andrew Beck (ed.), *The English Catholics 1850–1950: Essays to Commemorate the Restoration of the Hierarchy of England and Wales* (London: Burns and Oates, 1950), pp. 506ff; Peter G. McCaffrey, “Catholic Radicalism and Counter-Radicalism: A Comparative Study of England and the Netherlands” (unpublished University of Oxford DPhil thesis, 1979), p. 134 (n. 128); Peter Stanford, *Cardinal Hume and the Changing Face of English Catholicism* (London: G. Chapman, 1993), p. 11.

³² Dom Benet Innes, “Most People are Good-Tempered about it but – How are YOU liking the New Liturgy?” *The Universe and Catholic Times*, July 30, 1965, p. 6. (hereafter *The Universe*).

³³ See “E-day is November 29th,” *The Universe*, July 31, 1964, p. 1 and “E-day and an enthusiastic response: Mass in English gets off to a good start,” *The Universe*, December 4, 1964, p. 22.

³⁴ For further discussion of the specifics of these changes, see J. R. Ainslie, J. D. Crichton and H. E. Winstone, *English Catholic Worship: Liturgical Renewal in England since 1990* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1979), pp. 79ff.

³⁵ For a discussion of other elements of liturgical change, see Adrian Hastings (ed.), *Modern Catholicism: Vatican II and After* (Oxford University Press, 1991) and Michael P. Hornsby-Smith, *The Changing Parish: A Study of Parishes, Priests and Parishioners after Vatican II* (London: Routledge, 1989).

³⁶ Personal advertisement, *The Times*, November 30, 1964. See also “. . . And for those who still want Latin,” *The Universe*, January 22, 1965, p. 1.

³⁷ For further information on Cathleen Hindmarsh and her motivations, see Clement Dane, “Housewife leads the fight to save Latin,” *The Universe*, April 23, 1965, p. 3. Geoffrey Houghton-Brown recounts that his advertisement was the stimulus to Mrs. Hindmarsh’s notice in *The Guardian*, generating 3,000 signatures and her appearance on BBC Radio 4’s *Today Programme*. See Houghton-Brown, *Notes*, p. 6 (1964).

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ *Daily Telegraph*, November 12, 1964, p. 16 and follow-up correspondence from Douglass Woodruff, “Latin Liturgy,” *Daily Telegraph*, November 17, 1964, p. 16.

-
- ⁴¹ Houghton-Brown, *Notes*, p. 1 (1965). Founding members were Hugh Byrne, Peter Kenworthy-Browne, Jean Le Clercq, Kathleen Hindmarsh, Gillian Edwards, Ruth McQuillan, Mrs. Mary Teresa Parnell, Barbara Witty, Anthony Couldery, and Miss Lowe. Sir Arnold Lunn was appointed president shortly thereafter (pp. 4–5).
- ⁴² Carol Byrne, *A Guide to the Latin Mass Society: Its Purpose and Functions* (London: Latin Mass Society, 1997).
- ⁴³ Houghton-Brown *Notes*, p. 2 (1969).
- ⁴⁴ Houghton-Brown *Notes*, p. 14 (1971) – although some put the figure at 3,500, with 1,300 paying subscriptions.
- ⁴⁵ The group district leaders in 1966 in the Diocese of Westminster were Mr. R. L. Travers, Miss Sheila Johnson, Mrs. Mary Teresa Parnell, Miss Joan Williams, Miss Moltene, Mrs. Cloudesley Seddon, Mrs. Hughes-Smith, Mr. A. J. Booker, Mrs. Ursula Carr, Lady Mitchell Cotts (sister of Nicholas Throckmorton) and Mrs. Stigell acting as accountant/treasurer. See Houghton-Brown, *Notes*, pp. 4–6 (1966). C.f. Jay P. Corrin, *Catholic Progressives in England After Vatican II* (University of Notre Dame Press, 2013), pp. 157–8 who described the LMS as an organization of converts, “Old Catholic families” and (citing Robert Nowell) “old men.”
- ⁴⁶ Houghton-Brown, *Notes*, pp. 4–5 (1966) and p. 13 (1969).
- ⁴⁷ See John Carmel Heenan, *Not the Whole Truth: An Autobiography* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1971) and *A Crown of Thorns*; Scott M. P. Reid, *A Bitter Trail: Evelyn Waugh and John Carmel Cardinal Heenan on the Liturgical Changes* (London: Saint Austin Press, 2000) and James Hagerty, *Cardinal John Heenan* (Leominster: Gracewing, 2013).
- ⁴⁸ See Houghton-Brown, *Notes*, (1969), p. 6, and an associated survey of LMS members in which 66 percent expressed commitment to the Tridentine Mass (rather than Latin itself). For a flavor of these discussions, see Mrs. R. Richards, *Latin Mass Society Bulletin*, no. 15, July 1969, pp. 3–4.
- ⁴⁹ Published with great debate and publicity, “Appeal to reserve Mass sent to the Vatican,” *The Times*, July 6, 1971, p. 5. The well-known and mostly non-Catholic signatories included Kenneth Clark, Robert Graves, Graham Greene, F. R. Leavis, Cecil Day Lewis, Yehudi Menuhin, Nancy Mitford, Iris Murdoch, William Rees-Mogg (editor of *The Times*), Anglican Bishop John Ripon and Joan Sutherland.
- ⁵⁰ Letter from A. Bugnini, secretary of the Sacra Congregation Pro Culta Divino, November 5, 1971, see Houghton-Brown, *Notes*, p. 13 (1972).
- ⁵¹ Houghton-Brown, *Notes*, p. 14 (1972). Polish Catholics in London also seemed to support the retention of the Latin Mass. See the election of Miss Ewa Csaykowska to the LMS committee on May 8, 1971, Houghton-Brown, *Notes*, p. 5 (1971).
- ⁵² Hastings (ed.), *Modern Catholicism*, p. 368.
- ⁵³ See the article in the *Sunday Telegraph*, November 30, 1969, lamenting the loss of the mass of Palestrina and Bach to be “replaced by a ritual hotch potch,” and *Daily Telegraph*, January 2, 1970, discussing the substitution of “the noble and traditional language of the old Mass [with] the language of a public notice of a government advertisement about the joys of Post Office life,” cited in Houghton-Brown, *Notes*, p. 14 (1969) and p. 1 (1970).
- ⁵⁴ Corrin, *Catholic Progressives*, pp.159–60.
- ⁵⁵ Contrast, for example, the uncontroversial acceptance of the changes in Ireland recounted in Hastings (ed.), *Modern Catholicism*, p. 366 and the speed with which Australian Bishops introduced the vernacular, as reported in “English in the Australian Mass,” *The Tablet*, June 27, 1964, pp. 731–2; On “They Already have

Breviary in English,” *The Universe*, January 21, 1964, p. 7 and “English in the Mass: All are ‘Enthusiastic,’” *The Universe*, July 31, 1964, p. 2. Note however that there were Maltese, Australian and Canadian members of the LMS, Houghton-Brown, *Notes*, p. 9 (1965).

⁵⁶ Rural areas posed particularly difficulties, and Mr. and Mrs. Kenworthy-Browne reported considerable episcopal opposition in Portsmouth and Clifton, see Houghton-Brown, *Notes*, p. 11 (1972). Other areas in which the LMS had difficulty utilizing the indult included Southwark, Hexham and Newcastle. See the extensive and fraught correspondence between Mrs. S. Coote and Bishop Lindsay from December 1980 to April 1981, LMS, miscellaneous correspondence file).

⁵⁷ See *The Most Beautiful Thing this Side of Heaven* (Glenview: Coalition in Support of Ecclesia Dei, 2002), pp. 46–8.

⁵⁸ Hugh Ross Williamson, *The Modern Mass: A Reversion to the Reforms of Cranmer* (Devon: Britons Publishing Company, 1969), p. 7.

⁵⁹ Richards, *The Liturgy in England*, p. 7.

⁶⁰ Evelyn Waugh, “Sweetness of Temper,” *The Tablet*, August 14, 1965, p. 914. See also Auberon Herbert, “National Liturgies and Catholic Unity,” *The Tablet*, July 11, 1964, p. 784.

⁶¹ Evelyn Waugh, “Fides Quaetenen Intellectum,” *The Tablet*, July 31, 1965, p. 864.

⁶² *Ibid.*

⁶³ Anonymous letter to Cardinal Heenan headed “The Observations of a very ordinary Catholic on the New Liturgy,” 1964, Archive of the Archdiocese of Westminster (hereafter AAW), Heenan, HE1/L6(a) Letters from the Laity 1964–8.

⁶⁴ Hugh Ross Williamson, *The Great Betrayal: Some Thoughts on the Invalidity of the New Mass* (Devon: Britons Publishing Company, 1969).

⁶⁵ Letter from Peter Hutton to Bishop Rudderham, December 15, 1967, p. 7, LMS, miscellaneous correspondence file.

⁶⁶ Letter from Ella Collier to Cardinal Heenan, December 15, 1964, AAW, Heenan, HE1/L6(a).

⁶⁷ Rev. H. E. G. Rope, “The Martyrs,” *The Universe*, May 15, 1964, p. 3.

⁶⁸ Rosalind H. A. Scott, “Ecclesia Semper Reformanda,” *The Tablet*, November 14, 1964, p. 1296.

⁶⁹ Corrin, *Catholic Progressives*, pp. 187, 216–50.

⁷⁰ J. D. Crichton, *The Church’s Worship: Considerations on the Liturgical Constitution of the Second Vatican Council* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1964), p. 121.

⁷¹ Joyce Carey, “Dragging our Feet over the Vernacular,” *The Tablet*, March 18, 1964, p. 361.

⁷² James Burtchaell, Edmund King, Peter Morgan, John Rawsthorne, Paul Racey, Harry Stratton, “Tarda Celeriter,” *The Tablet*, February 8, 1964, p. 164.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

⁷⁴ Douglas Woodruff, “Festina Lente,” *The Tablet*, February 1, 1964, p. 121.

⁷⁵ C. R. A. Cunliffe, “The New English Liturgy,” *The Tablet*, July 11, 1964, pp. 784–5.

⁷⁶ See J. A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development* (New York: Benziger, 1951–1955) and, critically, Reid, *The Organic Development of the Liturgy*, pp. 153ff.

⁷⁷ See T. F. Burns, “Hollis (Maurice) Christopher (1902–77),” www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/31248, accessed February 12, 2014.

- ⁷⁸ Christopher Hollis, "Let Christians Worship in their Own Languages of Love," *The Universe*, June 12, 1964, p. 9.
- ⁷⁹ Ibid.
- ⁸⁰ Randle Lunt, "Language, Truth and Liturgy," *The Tablet*, April 4, 1964, p. 387.
- ⁸¹ Letter from Dr. Anthony Roberts to Cardinal Heenan, February 12, 1970, AAW, Heenan, HE1/L6(b) Liturgy, Letters from the Laity 1969–70.
- ⁸² A. Manson (et. al.), "National Liturgies and Catholic Unity," *The Tablet*, July 18, 1964, pp. 811–2.
- ⁸³ J. A. Green, "Correspondence," *The Universe*, January 29, 1965, p. 3.
- ⁸⁴ Evelyn Waugh, "The Same Again, Please," *The Spectator*, November 23, 1962, pp. 785–8. See also letter from Mrs. Winifred Jackson (Reading) to Cardinal Heenan, October 23, 1964, AAW, Heenan, HE1/L6(a), who bewailed "expert liturgists, PhD monks and blue stockinged nuns, with computers where their hearts should be."
- ⁸⁵ George Scott, *The R.C.s: A Report on Roman Catholics in Britain Today* (London: Hutchinson, 1967); Kester Aspden, *Fortress Church: the English Roman Catholic Bishops and Politics, 1903–1963* (Leominster: Gracewing, 2002); Dennis Sewell, *Catholics: Britain's Largest Minority* (London: Viking, 2001); James Lothian, *The Making and Unmaking of the English Catholic Intellectual Community, 1910–1950* (University of Notre Dame Press, 2009).
- ⁸⁶ Douglas Woodruff, "Festina Lente," *The Tablet*, February 1, 1964, p. 120.
- ⁸⁷ Mary Douglas, *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology* (London: Harmond, 1973), p. 67.
- ⁸⁸ "Mention Unity and Out Comes Hidden Fears," *The Universe*, January 24, 1964, p. 10.
- ⁸⁹ Ibid.
- ⁹⁰ See Andrew Atherstone, "The Canonisation of the Forty English Martyrs: An Ecumenical Dilemma," *Recusant History* vol. 30, issue 4 (2011), 573–87.
- ⁹¹ See Alana Harris, *Faith in the Family: A Lived Religious History of English Catholicism, 1945–82* (Manchester University Press, 2013), pp. 233–50.
- ⁹² Office of the Vice Postulator, "Notes for Short Sermons on the English and Welsh Martyrs, c. 1960," Birmingham Archdiocese archives, hereafter BAA, AP/M6 Cause of the English and Welsh Martyrs 1955–62, folders 1–4.
- ⁹³ Joan Eland, "The Martyrs and Ecumenism," *The Tablet*, August 14, 1965, p. 914. See also her reply to Fr. Walsh in *The Tablet*, August 28, 1965, p. 963.
- ⁹⁴ Margaret FitzHerbert, "The Martyrs and Ecumenism," *The Tablet*, September 4, 1965, p. 985.
- ⁹⁵ Rev. H. E. G. Rope, "The Martyrs and Ecumenism," *The Tablet*, October 2, 1965, p. 1098.
- ⁹⁶ Ibid.
- ⁹⁷ For a selection of correspondence to Cardinal Heenan making reference to the "martyrs," see J. B. P. Hastie, November 21, 1965, AAW, Heenan, HE1/L6(a), and Adrian Bush, September 14, 1970; Giles Swayne, February 2, 1970 and Audrey Krynski, February 3, 1970, AAW, Heenan, HE1/L6(b).
- ⁹⁸ Letter from Roger de Wever to Cardinal Heenan, March 2, 1970, AAW, Heenan, HE1/L6(b).
- ⁹⁹ Ibid.
- ¹⁰⁰ Jerome Burrough, "The Mass that Matters," *The Tablet*, August 7, 1971, p. 773.
- ¹⁰¹ J. Walsh, "Vice-Postulator's Report to the Hierarchy of England and Wales on the State of the Cause of the Forty Martyrs," 1966 (BAA GPD/P/A1).

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ See Archivum Britannicum Societatis Iesus (ABSI), Cause of the English Martyrs, filing cabinet 34 “Lists of Favours and Petitions,” as discussed in Harris, *Faith in the Family*, pp. 243–7.

¹⁰⁴ Letter D. G. Galvin to Cardinal Heenan, November 11, 1970, AAW, Heenan, HE1/L6(b).

¹⁰⁵ See Houghton-Brown, *Notes*, p. 3 and 14 (1971) under SSPX priest Fr. Morgan and for a discussion of the real tensions within the LMS over whether officially to support Archbishop Lefebvre’s seminary, see Houghton-Brown, *Notes*, p. 8 (1972). Plans for LMS parishes (and provision of Latin masses) were mooted as early as 1969 by Maria Stigwell and Miss Pond, who had identified a disused church in Oxford, see Houghton-Brown, *Notes*, p. 7 (1969). In February 1970 a parish in Sanderstead (Surrey) was established by Major Hurst under Rev. Dr. Duffy, an Irish priest, whose salary was provided by assembly contributions, Houghton-Brown, *Notes*, p. 4 (1970). Other sites contemplated included Norwich, Houghton-Brown, *Notes*, p. 8 (1971).

¹⁰⁶ Letter from Barbara Mitchell Cots to Cardinal Heenan, January 28, 1970, AAW, Heenan, HE1/L6(b).

¹⁰⁷ E.g. Lawrence Black, “There was something about Mary: The National Viewers’ and Listeners Association and Social Movement History” in N. J. Crowson, Matthew Hilton and Kames McKay (eds.), *NGOs in Contemporary Britain: Non-State Actors in Society and Politics Since 1945* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2009), pp. 182–200.

¹⁰⁸ Letter from Sir Arnold Lunn to Cardinal Heenan, September 11, 1965, reproduced in Houghton-Brown, *Notes*, (1965), p. 9.

¹⁰⁹ Letter from Peter Kenworthy-Browne to Cardinal Heenan, November 12, 1965, AAW, Heenan, HE1/L6(a).

¹¹⁰ For an extended discussion and cross-denominational comparison, see Alana Harris, “‘The Prayer in the Syntax?’: The Roman Missal, the Book of Common Prayer and Changes in Liturgical Language, 1945–80” in Jane Garnett, Matthew Grimley, Alana Harris, Sarah Williams and William Whyte (eds.), *Redefining Christian Britain: Post-1945 Perspectives* (London: SCM Press, 2006), pp. 36–49.

¹¹¹ Letter from Margaret Peckham to Cardinal Heenan, February 11, 1964, AAW, Heenan, HE1/L6(b). Miss Peckham undertook clerical work for the LMS from 1965 onwards, see Houghton-Brown, *Notes*, (1965), p. 7.

¹¹² Mrs. F. Coupe, “The Dialogue Mass,” *The Tablet*, December 29, 1962, p. 1282.

¹¹³ Houghton-Brown, *Notes*, (1968), p. 8.

¹¹⁴ Letter from Mary Pegge to Cardinal Heenan, December 8, 1964, AAW, Heenan, HE1/L6(a).

¹¹⁵ Ibid. Contrast however James Mulligan, who praised the vernacular as providing for his children “a Liturgy they will see and understand, learn from and help to perform,” and thus “survive as Christians in a society which is too clearly the antithesis of what we believe to be right.” Letter from James Mulligan to Cardinal Heenan, December 7, 1964, AAW HE1/L6(a).

¹¹⁶ Letter from Mary Prendergast to Cardinal Heenan, September 20, 1970, AAW, Heenan, HE1/L6(b). For discussion of this Mass and its media coverage in the *Catholic Herald* and on the BBC, see Houghton-Brown, *Notes*, p. 19 (1970).

¹¹⁷ See e.g. his sermon in Westminster Cathedral on January 21, 1968, in which he praised “our forefathers [who were] ready to die for the Latin Mass” but contrasted the present in which “No Catholic in his sense would go to the stake to-day for the sake of any language. For the Mass, yes. . . . but not for customs and devotions,

however cherished, which are not essential to the faith.” Cited in Houghton-Brown, *Notes*, p. 5 (1968).

¹¹⁸ Much debate within this correspondence turned on the new canon and fears about a diminished priority given to transubstantiation and the Real Presence. This was especially heightened in view of the first ARCIC-agreed statement on *Eucharistic Doctrine* (1972) and the shifting Eucharistic emphasis within Catholic ecclesiology of the latter twentieth century generally. Space has not permitted a further elaboration here, but see Harris, *Faith in the Family*, chapter 3.

¹¹⁹ Letter from Dr. J. B. Robinson to Cardinal Heenan, February 11, 1970, AAW, Heenan, HE1/L6(b).

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, annexed response. See also letter from Cardinal Heenan to J. B. P. Hastie, November 21, 1965, AAW, Heenan, HE1/L6(a), which chastises the correspondent’s sarcastic celebration of the first anniversary of his forced separation from the sacraments with the opening line “Your letter makes me feel thoroughly ashamed of you. I did not know an intelligent Catholic could be so lacking in humility.”

¹²¹ For a beginning, situating Britain within the American context, see Robert Lair Kaiser, *The Politics of Sex and Religion: A Case Study in the Development of Doctrine 1962–1984*, 2nd ed. (Smashwords.com, 2012). With a specific focus on the English case, see Alana Harris, “Love Divine and Love Sublime: The Catholic Marriage Advisory Council, the National Marriage Guidance Movement and the State” in Alana Harris and Timothy Jones (eds.), *Love and Romance in Britain 1918–1970* (London: Palgrave, 2014), pp. 188–224 and Alana Harris, “‘The Writings of Querulous Women’: Contraception, Conscience and Clerical Authority in 1960s Britain,” 34(2)(2015) *British Catholic Studies*, 557–85.

¹²² Cardinal J. Heenan to Bishop G. P. Dwyer, February 28, 1970, BAA GPD/H/B5 Liturgy: General 1970–1.

¹²³ Clifford Longley, “Keeping the Tridentine Tradition: A Plea for the Latin Mass,” *The Times*, July 9, 1971, p. 2.

¹²⁴ See www.lms.org.uk/resources/documents/heen-an-indult, accessed February 28, 2013, and Clifford Longley, “Pope Sanctions Traditional Latin Mass in Britain,” *The Times*, December 2, 1971, p. 2.

¹²⁵ E.g. Requiem masses for deceased LMS members, Houghton-Brown, *Notes*, p. 8 (1966), p. 8 and p. 11 (1968), with the support of London Oratory priests such as Fr. Michael Crowdy and Fr. Mark Taylor. LMS prayer cards were also commissioned, featuring a drawing of the statue of Pope Pius V from the altar of Our Lady at the Brompton Oratory, Houghton-Brown, *Notes*, (1969), p. 2.

¹²⁶ Houghton-Brown, *Notes*, p. 3 and 6 (1969). One mass a month was celebrated in Latin, Houghton-Brown, *Notes*, p. 14 (1970).

¹²⁷ Editorial, “Order of the Mass,” *The Tablet*, September 6, 1975, p. 849.

¹²⁸ Bryan Houghton, *Mitre and Crook* (Plymouth: Roman Catholic Books, 1979) pp. 33–4.

¹²⁹ David Lodge, *How Far Can You Go?* (London: Penguin, 1980), pp. 81, 83, 42–3. See also Dorothy Spencer, “The Second Vatican Council and the English Catholic Novel,” unpublished PhD thesis, University of Liverpool, 1996.

¹³⁰ Letter from Cardinal Heenan to Mr. J. Moroney, December 17, 1964, AAW, Heenan, HE1/L6(a).

¹³¹ Letter from Monsignor Miles to Mrs. Olive Scott, May 22, 1969, AAW, Heenan, HE1/L6(b).

¹³² For a fascinating, contextualized discussion of these architectural innovations and transformations, see Robert Proctor, *Building the Modern Church: Roman Catholic Church Architecture in Britain, 1955 to 1975* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014).

¹³³ Oral history interview with Monsignor Canon Tom Egan, May 19, 2014 (typed transcribed notes).

¹³⁴ Bernard Jubb, “Less Sweetness of Temper,” *The Tablet*, August 21, 1965, p. 939.

¹³⁵ Mark Chapman, “Theology in the Public Arena: the Case of South Bank Religion” in Jane Garnett, Matthew Grimley and Alana Harris (eds.), *Redefining Christian Britain*, pp. 92–105.

¹³⁶ Letter from David Power to Cardinal Heenan, November 14, 1969, AAW, Heenan, HE1/L6(b).

¹³⁷ Ibid.

¹³⁸ Houghton-Brown, *Notes*, p. 7–10 (1972).

¹³⁹ Mrs. P. Pantcheff, Correspondence, *Catholic Herald*, March 22, 1974, p. 5.

¹⁴⁰ “Congress 1980,” *The Universe*, May 2, 1980, 14, 18–19.

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

¹⁴² Ibid.

¹⁴³ For a discussion of the written communications made to the NPC organizers by the Latin Mass Society, see Liverpool Diocesan Archives, S6 XXXVIIIa/23 Criticism in Press, Apos Delegate, Minority Report. Mrs. Sue Coote and David Crane wrote reports of their experience of being treated with “derision, animosity and hostility” (p. 3) by NPC delegates and their “minority interests” being likened to those of the Catholic Lesbian Sisterhood (p. 9), with assertion that the proceedings were manipulated to sideline discussion of the Tridentine Mass which was deemed a “hot potato.” See “Latin Mass Society: Reports from Delegates to the National Pastoral Congress – May 1980,” LMS, miscellaneous correspondence file). There is minimal coverage of liturgical issues, see *Congress Report: The Principal Documents of the 1980 National Pastoral Congress of England and Wales* (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1980), Sector A, p. 16, which advocates “the greatest possible variety of celebration of the one eucharist (within the limits laid down by the present rite) to meet the needs of different conditions and ages; children, teenagers, ethnic groups and others.”

¹⁴⁴ For a discussion of the reception of *Humanae Vitae*, and increasing radicalism among clergy and laity, see Corrin, *Catholic Progressives*, pp. 162–4; 168.

¹⁴⁵ Bishop Dwyer, cited in “More English: The Second Stage of Liturgical Reform,” *The Tablet*, March 20, 1965, p. 33.

¹⁴⁶ This is indeed asserted by the traditionalist priest (of the Diocese of Southwark) and NPC delegate (and author of the “Minority Report”) Michael Clifton in his *Before and After Vatican II: The English Scene* (Surbiton: Real Press, 1996). My thanks to Alan Whaits for this reference.

¹⁴⁷ Oral history interview with Monsignor Canon Tom Egan, May 19, 2014 (typed transcribed notes).

See also www.praytelligblog.com/index.php/2012/02/02/liturgical-pioneers-pull-out/, accessed May 31, 2014.

¹⁴⁸ Corrin, *Catholic Progressives*, pp. 190–3.